

## **Remarks**

In the present response, claims 1 – 21 and 34 are canceled; and claims 35 – 41 are newly presented. Claims 21 – 41 are presented for examination.

### **Claim Objections**

Claim 21 is objected to because the claim language is grammatically awkward. This objection is moot since claim 21 is rewritten.

### **Claim Rejections: 35 USC § 101**

Claims 21-34 are rejected under 35 USC § 101 because all process claims must be tied to another statutory class or transform data. These rejections are moot since claims 21-33 are rewritten to be directed to a computer system.

### **Claim Rejections: 35 USC § 102(b)**

Claims 21-34 are rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by USPN 5,517,405 (McAndrew). These rejections are traversed.

Applicants believe these rejections are moot in view of the amendments to claims 21-33 since these claims recite elements not taught or even suggested in McAndrew.

As one example, independent claim 1 recites a database that stores a decision tracking object model having data that includes questions posed by the users about the design of the product, answers to the questions, and decisions of the questions that decide a design aspect of the product. A graphical user interface enables the users to access the decision tracking object model and to enter the questions, the answers, and the decisions. The claim then recites a plurality of different software application tools that create objects for the design of the product and that use the graphical user interface to access the answers, the questions, and the decisions in the decision tracking object model.

McAndrew teaches a decision support tool that enables users to decide whether to accept or reject a proposed solution to a problem. Nowhere does McAndrew teach or even suggest software application tools that create objects for the design of the product and that use the graphical user interface to access the answers, the questions, and the decisions in the decision tracking object model.

For at least these reasons, claims 21-33 are not anticipated by McAndrew.

**Claim Rejections: 35 USC § 102(b)**

Claims 21-34 are rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by USPN 5,842,195 (Peters). These rejections are traversed.

Applicants believe these rejections are moot in view of the amendments to claims 21-33 since these claims recite elements not taught or even suggested in Peters.

As one example, independent claim 1 recites a database that stores a decision tracking object model having data that includes questions posed by the users about the design of the product, answers to the questions, and decisions of the questions that decide a design aspect of the product. A graphical user interface enables the users to access the decision tracking object model and to enter the questions, the answers, and the decisions. The claim then recites a plurality of different software application tools that create objects for the design of the product and that use the graphical user interface to access the answers, the questions, and the decisions in the decision tracking object model.

Peters teaches systems and methods for asking questions of computer users having access to e-mail and then collating their responses and presenting the responses in a database. Nowhere does Peters teach or even suggest software application tools that create objects for the design of the product and that use the graphical user interface to access the answers, the questions, and the decisions in the decision tracking object model.

For at least these reasons, claims 21-33 are not anticipated by Peters.

**Claim Rejections: 35 USC § 102(b)**

Claims 21-34 are rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by USPN 5,930,764 (Melchoine). These rejections are traversed.

Applicants believe these rejections are moot in view of the amendments to claims 21-33 since these claims recite elements not taught or even suggested in Melchoine.

As one example, independent claim 1 recites a database that stores a decision tracking object model having data that includes questions posed by the users about the design of the product, answers to the questions, and decisions of the questions that decide a design aspect of the product. A graphical user interface enables the users to access the decision tracking object model and to enter the questions, the answers, and the decisions. The claim then recites a plurality of different software application tools that create objects for the design

of the product and that use the graphical user interface to access the answers, the questions, and the decisions in the decision tracking object model.

Melchoine teaches a sales process support system and method that uses a centralized database to identify sales targets to improve marketing success. Nowhere does Melchoine teach or even suggest software application tools that create objects for the design of the product and that use the graphical user interface to access the answers, the questions, and the decisions in the decision tracking object model.

For at least these reasons, claims 21-33 are not anticipated by Melchoine.

### **New Claims**

Applicants add new claims 35 – 41. These claims recite elements not taught or suggested in the art of record. By way of example, independent claims 35 recites a database that stores a decision tracking object model having data that includes questions posed by users about a design of a product, answers to the questions, and decisions that decide a design aspect of the product. The claim then recites plural different software application tools that design the product and that use a graphical user interface to enter the answers, the questions, and the decisions. The art of record does not teach or suggest plural different software application tools that **both** design the product and use a GUI to enter the answers, questions, and decisions.

### **CONCLUSION**

In view of the above, Applicants believe that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Allowance of these claims is respectfully requested.

Any inquiry regarding this Amendment and Response should be directed to Philip S. Lyren at Telephone No. 832-236-5529. In addition, all correspondence should continue to be directed to the following address:

**Hewlett-Packard Company**  
Intellectual Property Administration  
P.O. Box 272400  
Fort Collins, Colorado 80527-2400

Respectfully submitted,

/Philip S. Lyren #40,709/

Philip S. Lyren  
Reg. No. 40,709  
Ph: 832-236-5529